



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,620	10/17/2003	John Dunagan	M1103.70235US00.	6507
45840 7590 01/30/2008 WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation) C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			EXAMINER FRINK, JOHN MOORE	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/686,620

Applicant(s)

DUNAGAN ET AL.

Examiner

John M. Frink

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/21/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 25-36 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 25-36 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11 and 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe: A large-scale and decentralized application-level multicast infrastructure (Castro et al., published in IEEE Journal 10/2002, but publicly available online 9/2002), hereafter Scribe, in view of Feibenbaum et al. (4,718,005), hereafter Feigenbaum, further in view of Crockett et al. (US 2003/0154243 A1), hereafter Crockett.

3. Regarding claim 1, Scribe shows a method of and a computer readable medium for providing a scalable multicast infrastructure for multicast messaging on an overlay network including a set of nodes (Introduction and pgs. 101 and 102), wherein each node in the set has a node name, the method comprising: disseminating messages through a multicast tree formed from a subset of the set of overlay nodes, wherein a root node of the multicast tree belongs to a first network region (pgs. 101 and 102) furthermore, it is inherent that said root node must belong to a network region).

Scribe does not show where a path in the multicast tree is prohibited from re-entering the first network region once the path leaves the first network region.

Feigenbaum shows where a path in the multicast tree is prohibited from re-entering the first network region once the path leaves the first network region (Fig. 17, col. 11 lines 14 – 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe with that of Feigenbaum in order to ensure that node requests do not result in endless looping, rendering the network unusable (Feigenbaum, col. 11 lines 14 – 64).

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum show utilizing node names, including an IP address for contacting a node whenever possible (Section III, A.3, Paragraph 1, and A.2 Paragraph 2)

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum do not show where the IP address corresponds to location information.

Crockett shows where an IP address corresponds to location information ([0048, 0096-0098]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum with that of Crockett as IP addresses are an extremely common way of contacting nodes, and IP addresses inherently disclose information about the nodes which they representing, thus providing a obvious choice for learning more about a node.

4. Regarding claim 2, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett further disclose wherein the multicast tree is formed by routing a subscription message from a subscriber node in the first network region to the root node, comprising: receiving the

subscription message at a node in the first network region; recording a forwarding pointer to a previous node from which the message was received; and forwarding the message to the root node by routing the message to a next node within the first network region, based on a node name of the next node (Scribe, Section III, A.2 and Figs. 3 – 5; specifically where said subscription message is represented in Scribe by a 'join' message, and where said root node is represented in Scribe by a 'rendez-vous point', and where said node name is represented by said 'nodeID' and 'nextID', which can both also be IP addresses).

5. Regarding claim 5, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett further disclose wherein a network region is one of a geographic locality and an administrative domain (Crockett [0048,0096-0098]).

6. Regarding claim 11, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett further disclose wherein an external node belonging to a second organization sends a subscription message to the root node of the multicast tree by determining an internet protocol address of a node in the first organization using a name service and sending the subscription message from the external node to the node belonging to the first organization using a network transport layer underlying the overlay network (Scribe, Section III, A.3).

7. Claims 3, 4 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Speakerman et al. (US 6,398,475 B1), hereafter Speakerman.

8. Regarding claim 3, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett show claim 1, including; forming a plurality of multicast trees (Scribe, Introduction, Paragraph 3) and forwarding the messages to subscribers through the plurality of multicast trees (Scribe, Section III, Paragraph 1).

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett do not show creating a topic for which messages are published and publishing messages about the topic to a root node of each of the plurality of multicast trees.

Speakerman shows creating a topic for which messages are published and publishing messages about the topic to a root node of each of the plurality of multicast trees (Abstract, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett with that of Speakerman in order to utilize a more efficient multicast tree structure that minimizes duplication of effort (Speakerman, col. 1).

9. Regarding claim 4, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Speakerman further show wherein a subscriber in the first network region finds the topic using a name service comprising a directory of topics published in the first network region (Speakerman, col. 3 line 25 – col. 4 line 24, Abstract).

10. Regarding claim 12, Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Speakerman further disclose maintaining a buffer at each node of each of the plurality of multicast trees to record recent messages (Scribe, pg. 105 col. 1 lines 13 – 16, Feigenbaum, col. 6 line 55 – col. 7 line 7).

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jonsson (US 2003/0162499 A1).

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett show claim 1.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett do not show wherein a network region comprises a subset of the set of overlay nodes, and wherein the network region is owned by an organization and each node in the network region also belongs to the organization.

Jonsson shows wherein a network region comprises a subset of the set of overlay nodes (Fig. 1, [0101-0102,0130-0132]), and wherein the network region is owned by an organization (Fig. 6, [0055,0078]) and each node in the network region also belongs to the organization (Fig. 1, [0101-0102,0130-0132]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum and Crockett with that of Jonsson in order to enable more routing options, such as via different external networks (Jonsson, Abstract).

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of mail.yahoo.co.uk (as shown in the provided Internet Archive page as existing in 1999).

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson show claim 6.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson do not show wherein the node name comprises an organizational indicator indicating ownership by the organization, and an organization-relative indicator that encodes one of a geographic locality and an administrative subdivision within the organization.

mail.yahoo.co.uk shows wherein the node name comprises an organizational indicator indicating ownership by the organization (in this case Yahoo, Inc.), and an organization-relative indicator that encodes one of a geographic locality (in this case, 'co.uk', indicating the United Kingdom) and an administrative subdivision within the organization (in this case, Yahoo, Inc.'s mail subdivision).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson with that of mail.yahoo.co.uk as such types of addresses provide useful descriptions to users and are commonly used identifiers.

13. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Novaes et al. (US 2003/0012130 A1), hereafter Novaes.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson show wherein an external node belonging to a second organization sends a subscription message to the root node of the multicast tree, further comprising: receiving the subscription message at a last node in the second organization, recording a forwarding pointer to a previous node from which the message was received at the last node (Scribe, pgs. 101 – 102), and modifying the subscription message (pg. 102, 'forward()' method).

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson do not show and determining that a next hop in a routing path to the root node is to a node not in the second organization; and modifying the subscription message to request that a node in the first organization forward messages directly to the last node.

Novaes shows determining that a next hop in a routing path to the root node is to a node not in the second organization; and modifying the subscription message to request that a node in the first organization forward messages directly to the last node ([0005-0009,0021-0024,0028,0041-0049,0069-0073]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson with that of Novaes in order to utilize a more efficient multicast infrastructure ([0045,0049]).

14. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson and Novaes as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Speakerman.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson and Novaes show claim 8.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson and Novaes do not show receiving a confirmation message from the node in the first organization.

Speakerman shows receiving a confirmation message from the node in the first organization (col. 4 line 65 – col. 5 line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett, Jonsson

and Novaes with that of Speakerman in to provide more relalbility when transferring messages.

15. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson, Novaes and Speakerman as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Burbeck et al. (US 7,143,139 B2), hereafter Burbeck.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson, Novaes, and Speakerman show claim 9.

Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett and Jonsson, Novaes, and Speakerman do not show wherein, if no confirmation message is received choosing a different node and forwarding the subscription request to the different node.

Burbeck shows wherein, if no confirmation message is received choosing a different node and forwarding the subscription request to the different node (col. 3 lines 26 –39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Feigenbaum, Crockett, Jonsson, Novaes and Speakerman with that of Burbeck in order to utilize all available routes for sending a subscription message to that the odds of the subscription being established is maximized.

16. Claims 25, 26, 27 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan (The Internet Multicase Backbone).

17. Regarding claims 25 and 38, Scribe shows a method of and computer readable medium for participating in a scalable multicast infrastructure for multicast messaging on an overlay network including a set of nodes, the method comprising: joining a first multicast tree including overlay nodes in an overlay routing path between a subscriber node and a root node of the first multicast tree (Introduction, pg. 101 and 102).

Scribe does not show joining a second multicast tree formed from the first multicast tree, wherein the second multicast tree includes a subset of the overlay nodes in the first multicast tree, the subset consisting of only nodes that voluntarily participate in message dissemination.

Speakerman shows joining a second multicast tree formed from the first multicast tree, wherein the second multicast tree includes a subset of the overlay nodes in the first multicast tree (Abstract, col. 1 lines 28 – 66, col. 2 lines 35 – 45, col. 3 lines 25 – 56, col. 5 lines 29 – 39, col. 5 lines 8 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe with that of Speakerman in order to utilize a more efficient multicast tree structure that minimizes duplication of effort (Speakerman, col. 1).

Scribe in view of Speakerman do not show the subset consisting of only nodes that voluntarily participate in message dissemination.

O'Sullivan shows the subset consisting of only nodes that voluntarily participate in message dissemination (Background).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Speakerman with that of O'Sullivan as the MBone system disclosed by O'Sullivan was old and well known at the time of the invention, of active interest to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, and involved research and experimentation in the same area as that of the invention.

18. Regarding claim 26, Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan further show wherein the first multicast tree includes a plurality of subscribers (Scribe, Section III, A.2 and Speakerman, col. 3 line 25 – col. 4 line 24).

19. Regarding claim 27, Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan further show wherein joining the first multicast tree includes sending a subscription message from a first node addressed to a root node through the overlay network, each node in the overlay routing path: receiving the subscription message at an intermediate node from a preceding node; recording a tree forwarding pointer that points to the preceding node at the intermediate node; and forwarding the subscription message to a next node, wherein the subscription message stops when it reaches one of the root node and another node in the first multicast tree (Scribe, Section A.2).

20. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan as applied to claims 26 and 27 above, and further in view of Novaes.

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan show claim 26 and 27.

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan do not show wherein forming the second multicast tree includes assuming forwarding duties of a non-participating node that does not wish to participate in message dissemination, wherein forwarding duties includes forwarding event messages received from a parent node of the non-participating node to a child node of the non-participating node.

Novaes shows wherein forming the second multicast tree includes assuming forwarding duties of a non-participating node wherein forwarding duties includes forwarding event messages received from a parent node of the non-participating node to a child node of the non-participating node ([0005-0009,0021-0024,0028,0041-0049,0069-0073]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan with that of Novaes in order to utilize a more efficient multicast infrastructure ([0045,0049]).

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan and Novaes do not show where said non-participating node does not wish to participate in message dissemination, but rather where it is either failed, disconnected, unavailable, or transient.

Logical reasoning dictates that a node, as a result of following through with a desire not to participate, would have the same effect as being either failed, disconnected or unavailable. Not wishing to, and thus not participating, would result in a node effectively being unavailable.

21. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan and Novaes as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Stanko (US 2005/0074126 A1).

22. Regarding claim 29, Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan and Novaes show claim 28, including delegating forwarding duties (Novaes [0005-0009,0021-0024,0028,0041-0049,0069-0073]) and after said forwarding duties have been delegated to an ancestor node of the participating node that is the non-participating node, wherein an ancestor node of the non-participating node is directed to forward messages directly to the participating node (Novanes, Figs. 2 – 5).

Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan and Novaes do not show where said delegation is achieved through the use of a unique delegation ticket that includes a pointer to the participating node.

Stanko shows where said delegation is achieved through the use of a unique delegation ticket that includes a pointer ([0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan and Novaes with that of Stanko in order to utilize a secured method of delegating tasks.

23. Regarding claim 30, Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko further show the generation of one delegation ticket (Stanko, [0059]).

Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko do not show where only one ticket is generated.

Logical reasoning dictates that generating only one ticket would be the most simple and least resource intensive method, and thus an obvious experimental choice.

24. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Traversat et al. (US 2002/0143855 A1), hereafter Traversat.

Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko show claim 29.

Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko do not show wherein the non-participating node must pass the delegation ticket to an ancestor node if the ancestor node is also a non-participating node.

Traversat shows relaying messages until the desired destination is reached ([0412]), and thus shows wherein the non-participating node must pass the delegation ticket to an ancestor node if the ancestor node is also a non-participating node, as if this extra pass did not occur, no joining process would occur and nothing meaningful/furthering the goals of claims 29 and 31 would have been accomplished.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan, Novaes and Stanko with that of Traversat in order to ensure messages achieve the purpose for which they were sent.

25. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Novaes.

26. Regarding claim 32, Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan show claim 25, including wherein joining the second multicast tree includes: receiving at the subscriber node a probe message from a node in the second tree, wherein each node in the first tree receiving the subscription message forwards the subscription message through the first tree until the subscription message is received by the node in the second tree, as well as sending instructional messages to nodes (Scribe, Introduction, Section III).

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan do not show sending a message to the node in the second tree instructing the node in the second tree to forward messages directly to the subscriber node.

Novaes shows where all nodes are maintained as members of a multicast tree, and if a node ceases to be a member, forming a direct path between the member nodes bypassing the non-member ([0005-0009,0021-0024,0028,0041-0049,0069-0073]), thus where a node in the second tree forwards messages directly to the subscriber node (see also Novaes, Figs. 2 – 5, which illustrate this exact process).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan with that of Novaes in order to utilize a more efficient multicast infrastructure ([0045,0049]).

27. Regarding claim 35, Scribe in view of Speakerman, O'Sullivan and Novaes further show creating a failure notification group including every node receiving the subscription message, wherein the failure notification group is created using a failure notification service, and wherein the failure notification service removes a relevant state

if a failure is ascertained (Novaes [0005-0009,0021-0024,0028,0041-0049,0069-0073], specifically where every node updates its routing information to reflect a node failure, and thus all nodes are part of said 'failure notification group' and where every node updates their routing information to route around a failed node, thus removing its 'state information' from their actively used routing tables).

28. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Burbeck et al. (US 7,143,139 B2), hereafter Burbeck.

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan show claim 25.

Scribe in view of Speakerman and O'Sullivan when the subscription message is received at a first node in the first tree, the first node forwards the subscription message to a parent node of the first node if the first node is not a node in the second tree and has not previously forwarded a subscription message to the parent node, nor do they show then subsequently forwarding a subscription message to a child node if the first node remains not in the second tree.

Burlock shows trying different nodes based on which is perceived as being best capable to respond and fulfill the request (col. 3 lines 26 – 39).

The examiner takes official notice that it would have been an obvious choice to first choose the parent node as a potential subscription route, and then if that failed (which is inherent if the requesting node remains not in the second tree) trying a child node. A node always has a finite number of connections, in a simple and common case, as is claimed, a node would have a parent and a child. Thus it would have been obvious

to experiment a choose to try first sending a request to the parent, then if that failed, the child, in order to utilize Burlock's disclosure of trying multiple routes until the desired result is achieved.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant begins by arguing, related to claim 1, that Feigenbaum does not show where a path in the multicast tree is prohibited from re-entering the first network region once the path leaves the first network region. Applicant's argues that 'providing a hop count which has the effect of preventing further forwarding when the hop count decrements to zero is very different from the claim limitation'. However, regardless Applicant's assertion, Feigenbaum clearly meets the claim language. Specifically, Feigenbaum shows, regarding node communications and 'topological restrictions' (col. 11 line 14), 'restrict(ing) transfer across network boundaries' (col. 11 lines 24-25) and further shows, that traffic 'originated in network A' would 'prevent further forwarding so that messages crossing between B and C could not re-enter A.' (col. 11 lines 45-48). This clearly meets the claim limitation of 'prohibiting reentering the first network region (represented by region A) once it leaves the first network region (represented by leaving network A for networks B and C). Applicant's arguments therefore are not persuasive.
3. Applicant continues by arguing, relating to claim 25, that Speakman 'does not describe or suggest joining a second multicast tree formed from a first multicast tree,

where the second multicast tree includes a subset of overlay nodes.' To support this argument, Applicant cites col. 2 lines 1 - 12 of Speakman. However, this section of Speakman was not utilized in the rejection made, and furthermore Applicant does not address the sections of Speakman that were cited. Speakman clearly shows multicast trees (col. 2 line 43), as well as 'joining a second multicast tree formed from a first multicast tree, where the second multicast tree includes a subset of overlay nodes' (col. 5 lines 30-38, showing joining said multicast tree; col. 5 lines 30 – 55 and col. 6 lines 50 - 65, showing where the second tree is formed from a first multicast tree and includes a subset of overlay nodes). For at least these reasons, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

4. Applicant next argues, relating to claim 25, that O'Sullivan does not show 'the subset consisting of only nodes that voluntarily participate in message dissemination', stating that the 'cooperative voluntary effort' described by O'Sullivan is different from the 'voluntary participation' claimed. However, Applicant does not provide any elaboration for this argument. Furthermore, O'Sullivan's disclosure clearly shows the cited claim limitations, including voluntary participation in a message dissemination network (Background). Applicant's argument, for at least these reasons, is not persuasive.

5. Applicant finally argues that the dependent claims should be allowable based on the arguments given and addressed above. However, this argument is unpersuasive given Applicant's previous argument's were similarly unpersuasive.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Frink whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/686,620
Art Unit: 2142

Page 20

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Frink

(571) 272-9686



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER